



LAND USE . STANDARDS . PROCEDURES

issue committee **REPORT**

INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY
Comprehensive Plan Update



LAND USE. STANDARDS . PROCEDURES

issue committee REPORT

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS

Bart Peterson, Mayor

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Harold Anderson

James J. Curtis

Gene Hendricks

Lee Marble

Brian P. Murphy

Robert J. Smith

Randolph L. Snyder

Ed Treacy

Sylvia Trotter

DEPARTMENT OF METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

Carolyn M. Coleman, Director

DIVISION OF PLANNING

Maury Plambeck, Administrator

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Keith Holdsworth, Principal Planner

AUGUST 2001

Credits

This process could not have been undertaken without the efforts of the committee members who volunteered so much of their time.

Harold Anderson, *Metropolitan Development Commission*

Pat Andrews, *Decatur Township Civic Council*

Ken Bartlett, *Decatur Township Civic Council*

Tag Birge, *Bose, McKinney and Evans*

John Braun, *MCANA*

Todd Dorcas, *City of Indianapolis*

Michael Gasser

George Haerle, *Nora Northside Community Council*

Steve Hormann, *Edward Rose Development Company*

Patrick Huehls, *Thompson-Edgewood Residential Association*

John Maren, *CDI Development*

Ed Mitro, *City of Zionsville*

John Oakley, *City of Indianapolis*

Lori Olivier, *Greater Allisonville Community Council*

John Ottensman, *Indiana University/Purdue University-Indianapolis- SPEA*

Norman Pace, *MCANA*

David Retherford

Jean Ritsema

Jeanette Robertson, *Pike Township Residents Association*

Margaret Schattner, *Northwest Perry Civic Corporation, Inc*

Bob Sewall, *Thompson-Edgewood Residential Association*

Bruce Sklare, *Bay Development Corporation*

J. P. Stancil, III

Roger Stephens, *Builder's Association of Greater Indianapolis*

John Sweezy, Sr., *Warren Township Development Association*

Gene Valanzano, *Baker and Daniels*

Nathan Wetzel, *Near North Development Corporation*

Phyllis Zimmerman, *Sierra Club*

Acknowledgements

The Committee would like to express gratitude for the contributions of the following individuals to the Land Use Standards and Procedures Issue Committee process:

Bobbie Bosch, Indy Parks Foundation

Dave Compton, R. N. Thompson and Associates

Robert Furlong, Martin Marietta

Ottis Guffey

Frank Hogan, Hill Valley Homeowners Association, Inc

Clarke Kahlo, Protect Our Rivers Now

John Myers, Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas, Inc

Mark Spatz, Sierra Club

Steve Striebeck, S. C. Striebeck and Company

Tammara Tracy, City of Indianapolis

The Committee would like to express thanks to the following agencies for providing meeting facilities to the Land Use Standards and Procedures Issue Committee:

Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center

Department of Parks and Recreation, Garfield Park Burello Center

Department of Parks and Recreation, Garfield Park Conservatory

Executive Summary

The following is the Final Report of the Land Use Standards and Procedures Issue Committee. The committee members brought a wide variety of backgrounds, interests and concerns to every discussion. The complexity and breath of issues addressed necessitated an additional meeting and a smaller group meeting on land use categories.

During the course of the Issue Committee meetings, however, several challenges evolved. The Committee's mandate became two distinct parts. First, the Committee was to evaluate the composition of the current Comprehensive Plan, discover what worked, what needed improvement and what needed to be discarded. Second, the Committee was to evaluate the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan through the application of the ordinances, policies and procedures of the City.

The report reflects a consensus of opinions on some of those challenging topics. The committee was not able to resolve every issue that was discussed during the meetings and not every issue could be adequately discussed. Our recommendations, therefore, not only include issues that were resolved during the process, but recommendations to further study issues that were not adequately addressed.

Some of the notable accomplishments of this committee are:

Introduction of new land use categories. One of the common problems associated with the previous Comprehensive Plan was the residential density ranges. Specifically, there was a perception that the low-density range of two to five units per acre was too broad. The Committee has created six residential density ranges out of the original four, which splits the low-density range into two ranges and created a range between five and eight units per acre. Additionally, we have created two mixed-use categories that are designed to encourage innovative developments or retain the character of our diverse community.

Addressing deviations from the Comprehensive Plan recommendation. The Committee is concerned with the perception that the recommendations of the Plan have, historically, not been followed. While we understand that the Plan can not precisely predict how the City will look in ten years, we also believe that the Plan creates an expectation in the community. To adequately address both, the Committee believes that the Comprehensive Plan should provide guidance concerning when a deviation from the Plan is appropriate. Additionally, impact statements should be filed with rezoning petitions which do not comply with the Comprehensive Plan, contrasting the impacts of the proposed development with the probable impacts of the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Revising the method in which density is calculated. In the past, density has been calculated as a function of the whole property. This method, however, does not take into consideration the realities of distinct parcels of property which may contain natural features that limit development. In our recommendations, we propose that density should be calculated based upon the features of individual parcels, and that floodways, levees and certain rights-of-way should be excluded from density calculations.

“In exercising their zoning powers, the local authorities must act for the benefit of the community as a whole following a calm and deliberate consideration of the alternatives, and not because of the whims of either an articulate minority or even a majority of the community... Thus, the mandate is not a mere technicality, which serves only as an obstacle course for public officials to overcome in carrying out their duties. Rather, the Comprehensive Plan is the essence of zoning. Without it, there can be no rational allocation of land use.”

United States Supreme Court
Udell v. Haas

Contents

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	3
Introduction	5
Committee Description	7
II. SOLUTION FINDING	9
Issues, Recommendations, and Standards	
Issue: Format	11
Issue: Guidance	13
Issue: Compatibility	15
III. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION	19
Appendices	
Appendix 1 – Comprehensive Planning	21
Appendix 2 – Values Statements	25
Appendix 3 – Resources	27
Appendix 4 – Meeting Minutes	29
Appendix 5 – Land Use Categories	53
Appendix 6 – Glossary	59

Background
INFORMATION

Introduction

Updating the Indianapolis/Marion County Comprehensive Plan is a complex and challenging undertaking, which offers an opportunity for the City and its citizens to develop a realistic vision for the future.

The Land Use Standards and Procedures Issue Committee is one of eight Issue Committees providing a detailed public discussion of specific topics. Each committee was made up of approximately 30 to 40 experts, city staff and citizens to discuss issues and develop goals, recommendations and standards in their particular topical area. The committee meetings were open to the public.

The public input process of the Comprehensive Plan Update began with four Town Hall Meetings. These meetings were held in various locations around the city and on various weeknights in late September and early October 2000. Through the course of the Town Hall meetings, several recurring themes became evident; however, the format of the Town Hall meetings did not encourage in-depth analysis; therefore, eight issue committees were formed to provide additional analysis.

The eight committees formed were:

- Cultural, Social and Education
- Economic Development
- Environment, Parks and Open Space
- Land Use Standards and Procedures
- Neighborhoods and Housing
- Redevelopment
- Regionalism
- Transportation and Infrastructure

Each of the Issue Committees met eight to nine times from late January to late July 2001. The invitation to join an issue committee was made at the Town Hall meetings and through a newsletter sent to over 1,200 persons and organizations, including every registered neighborhood association in the city. Over 300 persons volunteered to serve on a committee, and, once selected, committee members were polled as to their most convenient meeting times. The meetings were scheduled accordingly.

The Land Use Standards and Procedures Issue Committee met on nine occasions between January 29, 2001 and July 30, 2001. A total of 39 citizens

were invited to the meetings, and 33 individuals attended. Attendance at each meeting ranged from 18 to 29 persons, with the average being 24.

Committee Description

The Comprehensive Plan embodies a long-term strategy for development within the City of Indianapolis. As the City has grown, the Comprehensive Plan has been either completely revised, as was the case in 1965, 1969, 1977, 1984 and 1991-93, or has been updated, through the development of sub-area plans, redevelopment plans and thoroughfare plan revisions. The implementation of the plan, however, begins once the Plan is adopted or updated by the Metropolitan Development Commission, and the Plan is typically implemented through the application and enforcement of ordinances, policies and procedures.

The ability to implement the Plan depends on two factors: does the Plan realistically reflect the needs of the community and can the Plan be effectively translated into ordinances, policies and procedures for implementation.

This Committee was initially formed to develop the standards that will be used for the future Land Use Plan; to propose an approach to making land use recommendations; to study the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan, the zoning ordinances and the Rules of Procedure for the various appointed bodies; and to evaluate the methods the City uses to implement the Plan and administer and enforce the Ordinances. The Committee was to balance the desires of the Community with the requirements of the Law by determining action steps concerning the development of the land use plan; by recommending policies, procedures and revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, applicable ordinances and procedures; and to suggest a method to realistically implement the Comprehensive Plan.

During the course of the Issue Committee meetings, however, several challenges evolved. The Committee's mandate became of two distinct parts. First, the Committee was to evaluate the composition of the current Comprehensive Plan, discover what worked, what needed improvement and what needed to be discarded. Second, the Committee was to evaluate the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan through the application of the ordinances, policies and procedures of the City. Not every issue could be adequately discussed, and are, therefore included as starting points for future discussions.

The 1991-1993 Comprehensive Plan

The 1991-1993 Comprehensive Plan represented the combined knowledge and common sense of over 700 residents, more than 30,000 hours of professional planning work by City-County staff, and the expertise and support of hundreds of community leaders. The process to revise the Plan was highly participatory and consisted of an overall explanatory document, eight township segments, the Thoroughfare Plan and adopted subarea, redevelopment, and corridor plans. The abandonment of the guiding concepts of this Plan, therefore, was not a preferred course of action for the Committee.

The compliance of approved rezonings with the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan seems to indicate, however, that the Plan was not being totally implemented. Between January and December 2000, 145 rezoning cases were approved by the Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC). In those cases, the action of the MDC was consistent with the Plan for approximately 53 percent of the cases. Interestingly, for those same 145 cases, the recommendation of the Administrator was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for approximately 63 percent of the cases. The Committee believed, therefore, that a critical review of the 1991-1993 Plan is needed to ensure that the apparent compliance problems demonstrated by these statistics are not based in the structure of the Plan.

solution
FINDING

Issues, Recommendations and Standards

issue

FORMAT

Description

The general format of the Comprehensive Plan is an important consideration before attempting to update the Land Use Maps. Land use categories must be specified which will provide sufficient guidance to decision-makers for the many patterns of development within Indianapolis. The use of critical areas must be selective enough to ensure that these special designations will receive sufficient attention during land use processes. Significant natural and cultural amenities must be preserved to the extent possible under the law.

goal

Specify land use categories and critical areas to reduce interpretive errors, eliminate the destruction of environmentally-sensitive areas, conserve natural resources and project appropriate land use intensities based upon the capacities of supporting infrastructure.

<i>Standards:</i> <i>When developing the recommended land use maps for Marion County:</i>	<i>Justification</i>
<p>i. The Comprehensive Plan should contain the following primary land use categories:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Residential Land Use Density Ranges:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">0.00< 1.75 units per acre 1.75< 3.50 units per acre 3.50< 5.00 units per acre 5.00< 8.00 units per acre 8.00< 15.00 units per acre More than 15.00 units per acre</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Urban Mixed-Use Village Mixed-Use Office Commercial Uses Community Commercial Uses Regional Commercial Uses Heavy Commercial Light Industrial General Industrial Park Linear Park Special Use Floodway Airport Related Mixed-Use</p>	<p>The residential categories provide for a range of housing types appropriate to the range of conditions found throughout the City.</p> <p>One zoning classification exists for office uses, so office land use categories were consolidated.</p> <p>“General industrial” includes both light industrial and heavy industrial development.</p> <p>The inclusion of mixed-use categories addresses some the limitations of classifications, since specific land use recommendations are not consistent with urban development or the historic villages of Indianapolis. Additionally, airports have impacts, which make residential development in proximity to airport property undesirable.</p>
<p>ii. The Comprehensive Plan should contain the following secondary land use category:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Environmentally Sensitive.</p>	<p>In conjunction with the Floodway category, this secondary use designation will provide safeguards to significant environmental amenities.</p>

issue

GUIDANCE

State statute requires that decision-makers pay reasonable regard to the Comprehensive Plan when making land use decisions. As a guide for the development of the City, the Comprehensive Plan should provide specific guidance to decision-makers concerning appropriate land uses for a specific parcel of property and should specify the conditions where a deviation from that recommendation may be appropriate.

goal

Provide the City-County Council, Metropolitan Development Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals and the Administrator with appropriate guidelines for making land use decisions.

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a. Establish specific impact statements as a justification for a deviation from a recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. Said impact statement should be incorporated into the Rules of Procedures of the Metropolitan Development Commission and Boards of Zoning Appeals.	DMD, MCANA	The impact statement should provide a comparison between a requested land use and the typical impact of a the Comprehensive Plan recommendation

issue

COMPATIBILITY

The goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to produce an attractive city with a high quality of life. To ensure a high quality of life, smooth transitions between land uses of differing intensities and attractive, inviting amenities are essential.

goal

Discourage or prevent the encroachment of incompatible uses into areas dominated by protected land uses and require minimum standards for aesthetics.

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Comments</i>
a. Establish a Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee to develop recommendations for amendments and additions to zoning ordinances that protect, maintain or improve the visual image of the City.	DMD	
b. Amend the Dwelling District Zoning Ordinance to provide for minimum standards in a Planned Unit Development and to specify filing requirements.	DMD	Filing should be reviewed to see if a proposed development could be developed in a specific numbered district.
c. Amend the Commercial Zoning Ordinance to provide for development standards in the C-S District based on development standards of the district wherein the most intense use requested in the rezoning petition would be permitted by right and to specify filing requirements.	DMD	
d. Form a study group to review and recommend improvements to the CS and DP zoning district ordinances.	DMD	
e. Limit lot reduction under the cluster option by establishing a district-by-district minimum lot size.	DMD	Minimize incompatible transitions between residential subdivisions

f. Amend the Sign Regulations and Commercial Zoning Ordinance to eliminate the proliferation of signs.	DMD	
g. Update the Gravel, Sand and Barrow Zoning Ordinance to provide sufficient safeguards to protect the environment, remediate property, increase bonding requirements and provide for traffic impact studies.	DMD	
h. Amend the zoning ordinances to include enforceable lighting standards.	DMD	
i. Consolidate inspection, permitting and planning staffs at a common location.	DMD	
j. Preserve natural areas and increase landscape buffering to transition from commercial/industrial areas and residential areas. In addition to buffering, this will provide attractive views of the natural scenery and neighborhoods of the City.	DMD	
k. Incorporate use overlay or neighborhood ordinances to address individual area needs.	DMD	
l. Initiate a Tree Conservation Ordinance.	DMD, City Forester	

supplemental
INFORMATION

Appendices

appendix one

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

The Comprehensive Plan is a broad philosophical document, which promotes public health, safety, morals, convenience, order and the general welfare; encourages efficiency and economy in the process of development; promotes livability; and preserves the quality of life.

While the Comprehensive Plan is, by state law, the basis for zoning, the Plan may be developed for more than this limited purpose. State law requires that the Plan contain a statement of objectives for the future development of the City, a statement of policy for land use development and a statement of policy for the development of public ways, public places, public lands, public structures and public utilities. State law, however, permits each jurisdiction to develop a comprehensive plan in a manner, which meets the needs of that jurisdiction.

In the Consolidated City of Indianapolis, the Comprehensive Plan has historically been more than a series of policy statements. It has been a detailed guide for development, containing policies, maps, text and critical areas, which designate appropriate use recommendations for land in Indianapolis and explain the basis for those recommendations. The Plan, initially adopted in 1965, has been updated in roughly 7 to 10 year increments, with the most recent update occurring between 1991 and 1993.

Extensive public input has also been a historic part of the comprehensive planning process. Indianapolis Insight began with a kick-off conference, was followed by a series of town hall meetings and has, thus far, continued with the Issue Committee process. Throughout the planning process a Steering Committee has kept things on track. Other forms of public outreach included press releases, a newsletter and a website.

Kick-off Conference

The Kick-off Conference was held September 14th, 2000. Over 1000 persons were invited to attend, and attendance was estimated at 220 persons for the morning-long event. The event included a presentation by Dr. Catherine Ross of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority, a panel discussion by local leaders with various viewpoints on the topic of city development and

a presentation of the planning process to be used for the Indianapolis Insight Plan. The conference was covered in the local news media.

Town Hall Meetings

The first series of Town Hall Meetings was held between September and October of 2000. Over 1200 persons were invited, including every registered neighborhood organization. Meetings were held in four locations around the city on various nights of the week over the three-week period. Attendance ranged from 20 to 40 persons per meeting. Participants were asked about what city development issues were important to them now and in the future and were given the opportunity to volunteer for the issue committees. Three of the four meetings were covered by the local news media.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is made up of 43 persons representing various groups with a stake in the development of the city. Its membership includes the chairpersons of the Issue Committees. The Steering Committee meets as needed throughout the planning process.

Newsletters

A newsletter, *The View*, was sent out in November 2000. Mailed to over 1200 persons, including every registered neighborhood organization, *The View* contained information on the planning process to date and the invitation to take part in the Issue Committees.

Subsequent issues of *The View* will be sent out as needed throughout the planning process.

Press Releases

The local media has been notified about the Indianapolis Insight Plan at every step in the process. Press releases and media advisories go to 50 television, radio, and print media sources. The decision to run a notice about upcoming meetings or to cover a particular meeting is up to each media source; however, coverage has been good and notices and stories have run in a variety of television, radio and print sources.

Website

The Indianapolis Insight plan maintains a set of webpages within the City's website. These webpages detail the planning process and include notices of upcoming meetings and minutes of past meetings. The webpages have

experienced over 1,000 hits from mid-December 2000 through the end of July 2001.

Volunteer Hours

As of July 31, 2001, almost 700 volunteers have contributed over 3,500 hours to the planning process.

appendix two:
VALUE STATEMENTS

Using the public comment at the Town Hall meetings, as well as good planning principles, the Steering Committee developed a series of Value Statements to guide the planning process. Ideally all goals, recommendations, standards and land use recommendations will contribute to these values. At the very least they must not detract from these values. The Value Statements are as follows:

Development of our City should meet the needs of the present without compromising the need of future generations.

We should strive to achieve a balance of land uses, including a diversity of housing options, throughout the various parts of the county and the region. Balanced land use is important not only for tax base equity, but also for communities where people can live, shop, recreate and earn a living throughout the different phases of their lives.

New developments should be well planned, well built and well maintained to retain value over the long term. Established areas should be well maintained to retain (or regain) value and to preserve applicable unique identities.

Education programs of the highest quality are vital to the health and well being of the City. We should encourage all citizens, regardless of age, to participate in the learning process throughout their lives. We should offer educational programs to individuals with a wide range of talents and abilities, enabling all members of the community to develop to their fullest potential. We must ensure that educational opportunities are available to all citizens, regardless of race, sex, religion, national origin or handicapping condition. We must maintain a world class educational system, providing programs of the highest quality to all citizens.

We should strive to maintain a healthy environment and to make appropriate improvements to the current state of the environment. Of particular importance are clean air, ground and surface water, conservation of natural features including wooded areas, and adequate parks and open space.

We should continue to improve our transportation system so that it is well connected, convenient, and safe. We should provide a variety of transportation choices so that all people, regardless of age or ability, can

travel throughout the region. The transportation and infrastructure systems should anticipate and guide the growth of the City.

We should maintain and further develop a strong, diverse economy and make efforts to attract and retain highly skilled and educated workers. Forces of disinvestment and decline should be countered with a variety of redevelopment and reinvestment activities wherever needed to maintain the vitality of the community.

The Regional Center should continue as the focus of the larger scale cultural events and venues, however we should support a variety of cultural activities within all parts of the city. We should respect historic structures and neighborhoods as the physical embodiment of our historical and cultural identity.

As the center of an increasingly regional metropolitan area, Indianapolis should be a leader in planning-related cooperation and communication.

appendix three:

RESOURCES

Indiana General Assembly. *Annotated Indiana Code, Title 36, Local Government, 36-7-1 to 36-8*. West Publishing Company, Saint Paul, Minnesota.

The City Plan Commission, City of Indianapolis, Indiana. *Preliminary Master Plan for the City of Indianapolis*. 27 January 1944.

Metropolitan Planning Department of Marion County, Indiana. *The Comprehensive General Land Use Plan*. 12 May 1965.

Metropolitan Planning Department of Marion County Indiana. *The Comprehensive General Land Use Plan*. November 1969.

Division of Planning and Zoning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis/Marion County. *The Comprehensive Plan for Marion County, Indiana*. 16 November 1977.

Division of Planning and Zoning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis/Marion County. *The Comprehensive Plan for Marion County, Indiana*. 7 March 1984.

Division of Planning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana. *The Comprehensive Plan*. 2 October 1991-17 February 1993.

Division of Planning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis. *The Official Thoroughfare Plan for Marion County, Indiana*. 7 July 1999.

Division of Planning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis. *Indianapolis Regional Center Plan 1990-2010*. 21 August 1991.

Division of Planning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis. *The Report of the Growth Advisory Committee*. February 2000.

Division of Planning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis. *Facilities and Services Needs Assessments: Compilation by Township*. 1998-2000.

Division of Planning, Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis. *Indianapolis Development Assets*. 30 October 1999.

Department of Parks and Recreation, City of Indianapolis. *Pathways to the Future: Indianapolis-Marion County Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan*. June 2000.

Department of Metropolitan Development, City of Indianapolis. *A Growth Policy for Indianapolis*. 17 September 1980.

Development Strategies and HNTB. *Projections of Population and Employment to 2025*. Indianapolis, Indiana. 25 January 2001.

The Polis Center. *Summary of Results Survey of Marion County Residents and Businesses on Public Facility Needs*. Indianapolis, Indiana. 2 July 1999.

Builder's Association of Greater Indianapolis. *Government Affairs Policies*. 21 October 1999. Retrieved on 26 April 2001 from <http://www.bagi.com/smartgrowth/sgrowth.html>.

Michiana Area Council of Governments. *Smart Growth Initiatives Handbook: A Guide for the Efficient Management of Growth*. South Bend, Indiana, 2000.

Central Indiana Regional Citizens' League. *Central Indiana Transportation and Land Use Vision Plan: Final Recommendations*. Indianapolis, Indiana. January 2000.

appendix four: **MEETING MINUTES**

MEETING ONE

January 29, 2001

**Committee Members
present:**

Ed Mitro
Margaret Schattner
John Sweezy, Sr.
Pat Hulce (for Tim
Ardnt)
Pat Andrews
John Maren
Lori Oliver

Phyllis Zimmerman
John Ottensmann
Bruce Sklare
Todd Dorcas
Robert W. Sewall
Jean Ritsema
Steve Hormann
Gene Valanzano
J. P. Stancil III
Roger Stephens

George Haerle
Clarke Kahlo
John Braun
Harold Anderson
Bob Furlong
Nathan Wetzel
John Oakley
Dave Retherford
Norman Pace

Others present:

Jeanette Robertson
Phillip Roth
John Myers
Tammara Tracy

Staff present:

Bill Peeples
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Code of Conduct-Bill Peeples
The Comprehensive Plan and the planning process-Bill Peeples
Administration of the Zoning Ordinance-Bill Peeples
Economic Base Study-Philip Roth

Discussions:

The Committee will use a strategic planning process to provide recommendations on policy issues.

Committee needs to look in depth at the perception issues associated with the Staff recommendation at zoning hearings. Neighborhoods feel like the zoning staff has more influence over decisions than they do, however the zoning staff feels like the neighborhoods have more influence over decision. Additionally, a process needs to be enacted to establish neighborhood-input prior to a recommendation by the staff to the appropriate appointed decision-making body.

There was significant discussion concerning capacity issues with our current permit review, zoning inspection and current planning staffs. The committee wanted to contrast the City's staffing with cities comparable to Indianapolis.

While the processes in Indianapolis are easy to work with some concerns are commitments that are enforceable and practical. One of the elements missing from Indianapolis' land use policy is the requirement to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy. Use of a certificate of occupancy may cut down on some of the enforcement cases.

There is a perception that the process is skewed to favor development.

Requests for information:

Nameplates should be made to aid in identification of the members at the meetings

A comprehensive list of Issue Committees and their membership for each committee member.

An informal survey of the number of current planners, zoning enforcement officials, and permit reviewers that are employed by a city comparable to Indianapolis.

Number of cases that are filed in the Current Planning section and a breakdown of the compliance with the Comprehensive Plan for these cases by staff recommendation and Board action.

Number of inspections conducted by the inspectors each year.

Number of permits reviewed by the permit review staff each year.

Decisions:

Meeting schedule will comply with schedule suggested by the staff. Location will continue to be at the Burrello Center in Garfield Park from 10:00 to 12:00.

Assignments:

Bill Peeples will compile requested information prior to next meeting.

MEETING TWO

February 26, 2001

Committee Members present:

Ed Mitro
Margaret Schattner
Pat Huehls (for Tim
Ardnt)
Pat Andrews
John Maren
Lori Oliver
Phyllis Zimmerman

John Ottensmann
Bruce Sklare
Todd Dorcas
Robert W. Sewall
Jean Ritsema
Michael Gasser
John Myers
Steve Hormann
Gene Valanzano
George Haerle

John Braun
Harold Anderson
Nathan Wetzel
John Oakley
Dave Retherford
Ken Bartlett
Tag Birge
Norman Pace

Others present:

Bob Merriman
Jeanette Robertson
Tammara Tracy

Staff present:

Bill Peeples
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Bill Peeples discussed the displays of the various Comprehensive Plans displayed in the meeting room. There were displays of the 1969, 1977, 1984 and 1991-1993 Comprehensive Plans. Additionally, a small display of certain recent sub-area plans, both urban and suburban plans, was present.

Bob Merriman discussed the use of various computer programs (Tidemark for permits, Table Editor for Current Planning, IndyDocs for document scanning purposes) and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) in the administration of land use and the potential for using these systems for the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussions:

Ed Mitro began the discussions by introducing topics for discussion, such as the use of hard lines or soft lines for land use categories, defining the land use classifications, critical areas and supporting documentation.

The initial topic concerned the use of hard and soft lines for land use recommendations. Hard lines assumed the ability to predict exact land use needs over an extended period. By their very nature, therefore, these types of land use recommendations tend to produce a number of future exceptions. Additionally, these kinds of recommendations do not encourage mixed-use development or diversity, and they are not flexible for the emergence of new markets.

Residential neighborhood organizations, however, advocate specificity. Concerns with introducing flexibility into a Comprehensive Plan are that the Plan would not provide an adequate guide for development and would encourage sprawl.

While some at the meeting would advocate expanding the role of the professional planner in the process, by creating a more flexible document; some believed, both from the development community and the residential neighborhood organizations, that the role of the staff should not be expanded. The development community expressed the belief that planners were slaves to the Comprehensive Plan, and would not deviate from the requirements of the plan, even when market conditions degrade the relevance of the Plan. Residential neighborhood organizations believe that the planners do not provide recommendations that are consistent with the letter and spirit of the Plan. It was also indicated that zoning

decisions, by state statute, are not constrained solely by Comprehensive Plan recommendations, but by a number of requirements, and that constraining the staff to interpreting the Comprehensive Plan may be a disservice to the appointed boards, committees and Commission.

A short discussion concerning the classifications used in the Comprehensive Plan centered on the inability to concretely match the current land use categories with an appropriate zoning district. The residential densities ranges appear to be too broad to provide for sufficient planning and recommendations such as "commercial cluster" are so vague that there is no zoning equivalent. Concern was expressed; however, that excessive specificity would turn the Comprehensive Plan into pseudo-zoning ordinance vice a broad philosophical document designed to guide development.

The diversity of Indianapolis, and the many stages of development, may dictate a hybrid of hard and soft recommendations. In other words, in urban settings, which are usually developed, the use of hard lines may be appropriate; while in rural settings the use of softer lines and policy statements may be adequate. The residential neighborhood organizations, however, believe that the rural setting requires less flexibility by its very nature.

Requests for information:

The information gathering process from the initial meeting is ongoing. Staff anticipates that this information will be presented at the April meetings.

Decisions:

None.

Assignments:

None.

MEETING THREE

March 12, 2001

**Committee Members
present:**

Ed Mitro
Margaret Schattner
Pat Andrews
John Maren
Phyllis Zimmerman
John Offensmann
Todd Dorcas

Robert W. Sewall
Jean Ritsema
Frank Hogan
John Sweezy, Sr.
Steve Striebeck
Norman Pace
Michael Gasser
John Myers
Steve Hormann

Gene Valanzano
George Haerle
John Braun
Harold Anderson
Nathan Wetzel
John Oakley
Jeanette Robertson
Tag Birge
J. P. Stancil, III

Others present:
None.

Staff present:
Bill Peebles
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

None.

Discussions:

The meeting began by discussing the strengths of the current Comprehensive Plan. The township focus was a source of significant discussion. Most of the members indicated that the plan should be updated at a township level; however, some members indicated that, while a township focus is appropriate, the City of Indianapolis is a leader for the region, and our Plan should have some regional aspects associated with it. Many members, most from residential neighborhood organizations, did not agree with the inclusion of regional aspects in this Plan.

Some discussion ensued concerning the use of word “neighborhoods” in one of the strengths associated with the Plan. Neighborhoods are perceived as exclusively residential, and the use of the term “neighborhoods” may be interpreted to exclude commercial and industrial development. The word “communities” may be more appropriate; however, “communities” could imply a broader area than certain members of the committees felt was appropriate.

Weaknesses of the Plan include the current land use categories, specifically the low-density residential recommendation, which has a density range of two to five units per acre. One suggestion was to split the low-density classification into two classifications; however, that may create a Plan that is more rigid than the current plan. One suggestion was to include specific policy statements to guide development, vice numerous classifications that would serve as nothing more than a pseudo-zoning ordinance. Policy statements can be crafted to permit flexibility in the location of land uses and promote mixed-uses, yet provide specific guidance for development. There was also discussion concerning the urban conservation and park recommendation, specifically, that those primary recommendations are ignored in favor of the indexed recommendations.

The “hard vs. soft land use recommendation” issue was discussed in more detail. At the previous meeting, a possible compromise was forwarded, where land use recommendations would have been more or less flexible based upon the stage of development wherein the property resided. Additionally, the location of “softer” land use recommendations was advocated along the County political boundaries. Residential neighborhood organizations, however, did not favor of these approaches.

The delineation of every parcel of property for a land use was a source of discussion. Some members did not believe that recommending a land use for property that is difficult or impossible to develop was appropriate. This practice, it was argued, artificially inflates the “gross density”. Additionally, the use of the DP process and cluster subdivision option produced “gross densities” that were appropriate on paper, but were inappropriate from a “net density” viewpoint.

The need for the inclusion of additional environmental and greenspace concerns and certain administrative and procedural issues were also discussed. The meeting concluded with a desire to compile a Comprehensive Plan that was a policy statement and a technical guide, which would be used as a tool instead of a weapon.

Requests for information:

None.

Decisions:

None.

Assignments:

Statistical information concerning:

Number of Current Planners, Permit Reviewers, and Zoning Inspectors in the City of Indianapolis in 2000.

Total Number of Petitions, Improvement Location Permits, and Inspections in 2000.

Information concerning compliance with the Comprehensive Plan by Staff recommendation and MDC action in 2000.

Information concerning use of the Certificate of Occupancy in Indianapolis.

Similar information for certain peer cities:

Columbus, Ohio

Saint Louis, Missouri

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MEETING FOUR

March 26, 2001

Committee Members present:

Norman Pace
Margaret Schattner
Ken Bartlett
John Maren
Phyllis Zimmerman
John Offensmann

Robert W. Sewall
Lori Oliver
John Sweezy, Sr.
Pat Huehls (for Tim
Ardnt)
Roger Stephens
Clarke Kahlo
Steve Hormann

Gene Valanzano
John Braun
David Retherford
Nathan Wetzel
David Compton
Jeanette Robertson
Tag Birge
Bruce Sklare

Others present: None.

Staff present:
Bill Peeples
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

None.

Discussions:

Ed Mitro had injured his back during the weekend prior to the meeting, so Bill Peeples acted as chairman. The initial topic provided for discussion was the continuation of Ed Mitro as the chairman of the issue committee. Mr. Mitro has taken a position as the Planning Director of the City of Zionsville. Upon taking this position, Mr. Mitro informed the City of Indianapolis and asked whether it would be considered a conflict to continue as the Chairman. After consultation within the Department of Metropolitan Development, the City concluded that there would be no conflict, since Mr. Mitro was a resident of the City. Concerns were expressed that he might not be able to devote the necessary time to the project, due to holding a job in a different planning jurisdiction or that conflicts might arise between Indianapolis' interests and Zionsville's interests. A vote was held and 16 members did not feel that there was in a conflict for Mr. Mitro to remain as chairman, 1 member felt that there was a conflict and three members abstained.

Bill Peeples spent some time going through the information he compiled concerning possible goal statements for the issue committee. After a brief discussion concerning the appropriate method to use to discuss the possible goals, the committee decided to go through the goals one at a time.

The first goal was discussed. There was discussion concerning the use of the term "to promote the rearing of children" in the goal. There was an opinion concerning that the reason for residential neighborhoods was to promote the rearing of children and that the phrase should remain. Most felt that rearing of children was an aspect of the quality of life. The committee ultimately decided to incorporate the rearing of children into quality of life, but there was concern about the exact definition of quality of life.

The second goal was discussed briefly. After the deletion of the term "strong" in front of "geographically-specific policy statements", the goal was adopted.

The third and fourth goals were the subject of extensive discussions. There was significant interest in including a goal that introduced flexibility into the plan. The discussion, therefore, commenced with a conglomeration of the third and fourth goal, with a proposed amendment by one of the members, which read:

“The Comprehensive Plan should be constructed with sufficient specificity to provide the City-County Council, Metropolitan Development Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals and the Administrator with appropriate guidelines for making land use decisions, but should be constructed with sufficient flexibility to adequately provide for future, yet unknown, innovations and market conditions”

The discussion primarily revolved around the inclusion of the last phrase of the goal, which would design a plan with flexibility for future conditions. Some of the members, mainly the academic, law and developer organizations, believed that it is essential to construct a plan that could be responsive to emerging markets and innovations. However, a roughly equal number of the committee, mainly representing residential neighborhood organizations, felt that the Plan should not contain that flexibility, since, it was expressed, that flexibility is to be in the process for implementing the plan (i.e. at the Board of Zoning Appeals and Metropolitan Development Commission levels) and not in the Plan itself. Ultimately, the committee adopted a goal without the flexibility language.

The discussion then focused on possibly combining the flexibility language with three of the remaining goals. However, discussions diverged from a focus on goal setting, and discussions on the benefits of open space, wetlands, and floodway/floodway fringe conservation ensued.

As the end of the meeting approached, the discussion on the previous four goals were “tabled” and a discussion began on the final goal outlined on the staff handout, which addressed land use categories. The goal was favorably received; however, there was discussion concerning the inclusion of infrastructure capacity as deciding factor in land use categories and recommendations.

The meeting concluded with defining the purpose of the next meeting. The next meeting will be a focused discussion on the land use categories and recommendations that have been used in the Comprehensive Plan are being used in other jurisdictions and will be used on this update of the Plan.

Requests for information:

Statistical breakdowns of planning related information.

Decisions:

Four goals were adopted.

Assignments:

Statistical information concerning:

Number of Current Planners, Permit Reviewers, and Zoning Inspectors in the City of Indianapolis in 2000.

Total Number of Petitions, Improvement Location Permits, and Inspections in 2000.

Information concerning compliance with the Comprehensive Plan by Staff recommendation and MDC action in 2000.

Information concerning use of the Certificate of Occupancy in Indianapolis.

Similar information for certain peer cities:

Columbus, Ohio
Saint Louis, Missouri
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MEETING FIVE

April 9, 2001

Committee Members

present:

Tag Birge
Todd Dorcas
Norman Pace
Margaret Schattner
Ken Bartlett
Phyllis Zimmerman

John Ottensmann
Robert W. Sewall
John Sweezy, Sr.
Harold Anderson
Pat Andrews
Steve Hormann
Gene Valanzano
John Braun

Nathan Wetzel
Jeanette Robertson
Bruce Sklare

Others present:

Ottis Guffey
Tammara Tracy

Staff present:

Bill Peeples
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

Bill Peeples gave a brief presentation on land use categories used previously by Indianapolis and other municipalities in Comprehensive Plans. One member questioned the methodology Mr. Peeples used in choosing the selected plans and suggested other plans to research.

Keith Holdsworth gave a presentation on the Code of Conduct.

Discussions:

The discussion revolved around the land use categories to be used in the updated Comprehensive Plan. There was concerns expressed that the current land use categories are not addressing our core needs; however, what we have is good and regression is not necessarily a good thing. The discussion turned to park classifications. The committee agreed, given the specifics outlined in the new Parks plan that the Comprehensive Plan need not specifically delineate the type of park existing or proposed.

The discussion then revolved around commercial classifications. The current Plan has two office categories and a one for one match for commercial recommendations and zoning districts. A suggestion was to reduce the number of specific land use categories, and provide guidance in the form of policy statements. Some were concerned that policy statements would not be incorporated into staff recommendations.

The topics for discussions during the next meeting will be the residential land use categories. Specifically, a recommendation that would help solves a problem with residential density calculation.

Requests for information:

None.

Decisions:

Some land use categories were delineated for the updated plan. The park categories were consolidated into one "Park" category. The commercial categories are "Office", "Neighborhood Commercial", General Commercial", and "Externally Oriented Commercial".

Assignments:

Statistical information concerning:

Number of Current Planners, Permit Reviewers, and Zoning Inspectors in the City of Indianapolis in 2000.

Total Number of Petitions, Improvement Location Permits, and Inspections in 2000.

Information concerning compliance with the Comprehensive Plan by Staff recommendation and MDC action in 2000.

Information concerning use of the Certificate of Occupancy in Indianapolis.

Similar information for certain peer cities:

Columbus, Ohio

Saint Louis, Missouri

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MEETING SIX

April 30, 2001

Committee Members

present:

Tag Birge
Todd Dorcas
Margaret Schattner
Ken Bartlett
Phyllis Zimmerman
Michael Gasser

John Oakley
Roger Stephens
Robert W. Sewall
John Sweezy, Sr.
David Retherford
Harold Anderson
Pat Andrews
Steve Hormann

Gene Valanzano
Norman Pace
John Braun
Nathan Wetzel
Jeanette Robertson
Bruce Sklare
George Haerle

Others present:

None.

Staff present:

Bill Peeples
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

None.

Discussions:

Meeting was called to order.

Due to the lateness in the process, the staff decided that Bill Peeples would act as the chairperson for the remainder of the process. The Committee has been reaching consensus at a pace slower than anticipated, so a decision was reached to delay the implementation discussion and create a Committee to discuss implementation strategies in conjunction with the update to the Land Use maps. Additionally, due to the pace of the Committee's deliberations, a ninth meeting was scheduled to continue discussions of the goals, recommendations and standards of the committee and provide adequate time to the format questions remaining.

The committee was subdivided into four topics for discussion: Land Use Categories and Critical Areas, Flexibility, Procedure and Aesthetics. There were minimal ground rules set for each topic. The members of the committee could move around to the various tables to discuss more than one topic. Bill Peeples prepared a list of goals, recommendations, and standards for each topic based upon the deliberations from each of the previous meetings. Additionally, members had submitted information and recommendations concerning topics for possible inclusion into the Committee's recommendation. Finally Bill Peeples surveyed other planners in order to present relevant topics that are being discussed in other issue committees. This information was placed on individual tables and the members were encouraged to move to a table that reflected their interests.

Land Use Categories and Critical Areas. Much of the discussion in this subcommittee revolved around residential land use categories. The subcommittee recommended that the categories should be portrayed in terms of maximum density instead of a range of densities. The majority of the discussions, however, revolved around defining those maximum densities. Specifically, the relationship between the very low-density residential and low-density residential categories were examined. The current low-density residential category has a range of 2 to 5 units per acre, and it is believed that the size of this range encompasses too many housing options to adequately provide for planning purposes. The subcommittee decided that this classification needs to be smaller. One of the recommendations forwarded at the table was the subdivision of residential land use categories into the following maximum density categories: 1, 3, 5, 8, 15, and 15+.

The subcommittee tentatively recommended further research and discussion will be necessary prior to the final recommendation.

Flexibility. The discussions of this subcommittee revolved around incorporating elements of flexibility in the land use plan. Essentially, the recommendations involved designing findings of fact that may be used to evaluate a proposed land use change that is inconsistent with the land use recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. There was a desire to incorporate these findings, not only in the text of the Comprehensive Plan, but to also incorporate them into the Rules of Procedure for the various appointed decision-making bodies. There needs to be a bridge, therefore, between the recommendations of this Committee and the Implementation Committee that will be formed later in the process. There was also discussion concerning applying the land use recommendations and findings for deviations from that recommendation more stringently or less stringently based upon the stage of development wherein a particular property is located. In other words, in those areas of the City/County, where the development pattern is less defined, the recommendations of the land use map should be less strictly followed.

Procedure. While this subcommittee is dealing with issues that will be discussed by a subsequent committee, there were certain issues forwarded by members of the Committee that need to be “fleshed out” prior to the constitution of the subsequent Committee. The DP and CS processes need to be tightened, with the application of specific standards in the Ordinance for each zoning classification. In order for a D-P request to be filed, it should contain mixed uses or residential development of distinctly different densities. Additionally, modifications to a DP, should be minimized once development has begun. The Gravel, Sand and Barrow Ordinance needs to be completely revised to ensure up-to-date standards are being applied to properties within those secondary districts. The priorities of the inspection staff need to be revised to eliminate the focus on junk, trash and debris and abandoned vehicle complaints to avoid duplication of effort with Health and Hospital inspectors. Inspectors, given their limited time, should receive the letter of grant, a copy of the site plan and any commitments associated with a land use petition. Finally, the Plan should incorporate overlay/neighborhood ordinances to address individual area needs. Ratios of the specific land use categories should remain about the same.

Aesthetics. This subcommittee reviewed issues concerning signage and light related issues. There was an indication that stringent light standards should be incorporated into the zoning ordinance and rigorously enforced. Additionally, standards should be incorporated into the various zoning ordinances that require the conservation of natural scenery in commercial, residential and industrial development. Efforts should be made to increase and augment the landscape buffering in transitional yards between commercial/industrial areas and residential development.

Requests for information:

None.

Decisions:

None.

Assignments:

Statistical information concerning:

Number of Current Planners, Permit Reviewers, and Zoning Inspectors in the City of Indianapolis in 2000.

Total Number of Petitions, Improvement Location Permits, and Inspections in 2000.

Information concerning compliance with the Comprehensive Plan by Staff recommendation and MDC action in 2000.

Information concerning use of the Certificate of Occupancy in Indianapolis.

MEETING SEVEN

June 4, 2001

Committee Members present:

Margaret Schattner
Ken Bartlett
Phyllis Zimmerman
Michael Gasser

Pat Huehls
John Ottensmann
John Sweezy, Sr.
David Retherford
Pat Andrews
Steve Hormann

Gene Valanzano
John Braun
Norman Pace
Todd Dorcas
George Haerle

Others present:
None.

Staff present:
Bill Peeples
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

None.

Discussions:

Keith Holdsworth called the meeting to order at 10:06. Mr. Holdsworth spoke on the state of the Comprehensive Plan update process. We have attempted to evaluate the current Plan and question each part, find out what has worked and augment it, and find out what is not working and replace it. Each issue committee has had up's and down's; however, the land use committee has had more issues associated with it than the others.

There were a series of handouts given to the committee, which included zoning administration statistics for the year 2000, a summary of 1998 rezonings, the goals, recommendations and standards that have evolved throughout the previous meetings and a copy of the report format.

The committee then began discussing the goals, recommendations and standards. Discussions started with the goal that dealt with a balanced interpretation. The committee discussed how natural areas should be preserved and left undisturbed. Additionally, there was a desire to combine several of the recommendations concerning light pollution.

The committee then discussed the goal designed to discourage or prevent incompatible uses. Several members of the committee believed that this goal and the previous goal should be combined, and the recommendations and standards should be moved. A number of the recommendations needed to be revised and phrased as recommendations. The cluster option recommendation needs to be changed requiring a district-by-district minimum lot size. The recommendation involving the Gravel, Sand and Barrow Ordinance update is moved to the Environment, Parks and Open Space Committee for action.

The committee then discussed the flexibility goal. A section of the goal was deleted which specifically stated flexibility due to a review of the minutes of a March meeting. There was some discussion concerning the inclusion of findings of fact for deviations from the Comprehensive Plan. Some believed that including such a finding would encourage more deviations from the Plan, while some believed that requiring a justification for a deviation from the Plan would put more focus on meeting the Plan. One neighborhood leader indicated that more flexibility in the application of the Plan in existing neighborhoods may be preferable in certain situations.

There are several issues left unresolved at the end of this meeting. The next meeting would be used to discuss the flexibility issue and the land use categories. Additionally, there are issues, such as form districts, critical areas, and density calculations which must be investigated.

The possibility of a subcommittee meeting was introduced and the next meeting date was set for July 9, 2001.

Requests for information:

None.

Decisions:

None.

Assignments:

None.

MEETING EIGHT

July 9, 2001

Committee Members present:

Margaret Schattner
Ken Bartlett
Phyllis Zimmerman
Harold Anderson
Tammara Tracy
John Offensmann

John Sweezy, Sr.
Roger Stephens
J. P. Stancil
Jeanette Robertson
John Maren
Bruce Sklare
John Oakley
David Retherford

Pat Andrews
Steve Hormann
Gene Valanzano
John Braun
Norman Pace
Todd Dorcas
George Haerle

Others present:
None.

Staff present:
Bill Peebles
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

None.

Discussions:

Meeting began at 10:00 with two staff members and twenty-one committee members present. The committee reviewed the minutes of the previous meeting and no comments concerning changes to the minutes were voiced.

Discussions began with the results from the subcommittee meeting concerning non-residential land use categories. One member believed, given the format of the text describing the land use category, that the “floodway” category may be better termed “floodplain”. The staff explained that the floodway land use category, is intended to show areas of the City that are undevelopable due to the regulatory restrictions associated with the floodway. The floodplain includes floodway fringes, wherein development is possible, so the use of the term “floodplain” would not describe the intent behind the category. After the discussion of the floodway category, the committee approved the remaining non-residential categories, provided the text of the floodway category was revised.

Once the discussions concerning the subcommittee meeting were concluded, the discussions turned toward the residential land use categories. As initially proposed, the number of categories were increased from 4 to 6 and were based upon maximum densities of 1, 3, 5, 8, 15 and unlimited units per acre. Concern was expressed concerning editorializing in the category description of 1 unit per acre maximum density. The description contained percentages of the possible amount of land that this category could consume and these percentages had not been approved by the subcommittee. Staff had included this information as a source of discussion. One member was concerned that there would not be a significant amount of property in Marion County, which could realistically be placed in a one unit per acre category. The intention behind this category was presented as the preservation of large lot, non-subdivided property. This category could also be considered for small farm or estate developments.

There was some discussion across the board concerning the abandonment of the range concept. Two points in favor of ranges are that they provide a constant reminder that it is not always appropriate to rezone property to the maximum density permitted and in the urban areas of the City, the bottom end of the range is important to preserve higher densities. A point made against ranges was that rezoning proposals are systematically filed at the high end of the range, and so the bottom end of the range is unnecessary. The committee, ultimately, decided to retain the range concept.

The use of whole numbers may not be appropriate. The decimals mean something to developers. If there are natural breaks, both in the term of market densities requested and the breaks defined in the zoning ordinances, then the breaks in the Comprehensive Plan should attempt to reflect those breaks, regardless of whether these breaks occur at whole numbers.

The current categories were placed on the white board. Additionally, Keith Holdsworth placed his ranges on the board. After some discussion concerning the differences between the various residential categories previously discussed, the committee agreed on breaks near the 3 unit per acre area and 8 unit per acre areas. There was some concern expressed with breaks at 1 unit per acre and 5 units per acre. A break at 5 units per acre seems to be denser than is appropriate in many suburban areas; however, the urban core of the city is developed with single-family residential development at densities between 6-8 units per acre. Ultimately, the committee agreed on the following categories based on density in units per acre:

0.00-1.75
1.75-3.50
3.50-5.00
5.00-8.00
8.00-15.00
15.00+

There were concerns expressed that these categories are appropriate as long as the current form of density calculation was retained. If the method used to calculate density was altered, then these categories would need to be reviewed.

Additionally, there was concern expressed that there are inadequate safeguards for the environment in the discussions. An opinion was expressed that the Comprehensive Plan has been weak on environmental protection. The City should aggressively protect the environment and should not focus on private property rights. The committee, however, recognized that the Plan could be subject to judicial review and that abandoning private property rights might subject the Plan to a legal challenge.

The Committee then began discussions concerning the filing of “findings” which would require the explanation of rezoning requests inconsistent with the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. The concern was expressed that recommendations of the Plan might be diluted if the Plan included specific provisions for deviating from the recommendations. Additionally, the inclusion of findings may encourage more deviations from the Plan recommendations. Many members, however, believed that filing some sort of “impact statement” on rezonings at the time of filing would provide insight on the appropriateness of a rezoning. However, these “findings” or “impact statements” should not be construed as a right to a rezoning if the conditions are met. The committee appeared to be positive about the concept; however, the concept must be fleshed out further before forwarding the concept to the Steering Committee as a recommendation.

It is important that this revision of the Plan not create two standards for developed and undeveloped areas of the City. There should not be the implication that the Plan would be stringently applied in one area and less stringently applied in other areas.

Staff was asked to develop a recommendation expressing a need for greater justifications for greater deviations from the Plan.

Requests for information:

Explanation concerning the method by which correspondence addressed to the appointed decision making bodies is forwarded to those bodies.

Decisions:

Non-residential land use categories were tentatively approved.

Residential land use densities were approved in concept, but text must be revised.

Assignments:

Revise the goals, recommendations, and standards to reflect the deliberations of the Committee.

NINTH MEETING

July 30, 2001

Committee Members present:

Phyllis Zimmerman
Harold Anderson
John Ottensmann
John Sweezy, Sr.
Jeanette Robertson

John Maren
Bob Sewall
Bruce Sklare
John Oakley
David Retherford
Pat Andrews
Steve Hormann

John Braun
Norman Pace
George Haerle

Others present:

Mark Spatz
Bobbie Bosch

Staff present:

Bill Peebles
Keith Holdsworth

Presentations:

None.

Discussions:

Meeting began at 10:03.

The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and no changes were suggested.

The land use categories were reviewed. There was some discussion concerning the inclusion of mass transit in the residential categories. Single-family residential density is a concern to fire departments due to the ability of fires to spread to buildings that are close together. However, fire codes are incorporated into building codes and are not necessarily needed in a Comprehensive Plan.

There was some concern expressed that the density ranges would not be sufficient, since many controversial zoning petitions are to D-2 and D-3. However, while the ranges may not be perfect, the number of density ranges have increased from 4 to 6, and the low-density range has been split. This is considered a step in the right direction.

The discussion turned to additional density issues. In calculating density, the laws vary from state to state; however, in Indiana, it appears that only floodways and levees may be excluded when calculating density. The discussion then turned to the cluster option of the Dwelling Districts Zoning Ordinance. There is a concern that the cluster option has no minimum lot size, which results in a "net density" vs. "gross density" disparity. There are good aspects to a cluster subdivision, such as the creation of open space and a reduction in infrastructure needs. The cluster option needs to be reworked to exclude retention and drainage facilities from open space calculations, since the Department of Public Works requires these facilities. The impression is that cluster subdivisions are being submitted to maximize lot coverage, and the Administrator is unable to deny a cluster submission due to ordinance shortcomings. Limiting the cluster option, however, could promote sprawl. The Parks Department has requested a change to the cluster option, which would permit the transfer of common area to parks. There was concern that the Comprehensive Plan should not reinforce the ability of developer to create subdivisions with smaller lots by dedicating parkland to the Parks Department.

The concern was expressed that the protection of environmental concerns appears to be "wimpy" in the Land Use Standards and Procedures Report, and that the Committee has favored private property rights at

the expense of the preservation of floodplains, woodlands and wetlands. This has had a long-term effect of encouraging poor drainage practices.

The format of critical areas should remain the same as they were from the previous plan.

Form districts are an interesting concept; however, the Louisville Plan was somewhat confusing in regards to the application of them. We have incorporated some of these concepts historically in the form of the Regional Center overlay, historic districts and sub-area plans. The inclusion of urban and village mixed use districts can serve as form districts, provided these concepts are followed up with significant text to guide future development and that text is a result from a public process.

Net density is an important concept, and should be included in the Plan in some way. Neighborhoods may need flexibility to remonstrate against a petition, even if the petition is consistent with the substance of the Plan, because the request is not consistent with the Plan's intent. The inclusion of the "net density" concept would permit this. Density calculations should not take into consideration legally excluded exceptions to the legal description (interstate and state highway rights-of-way), and sensitive environmental features (steep slopes, wetlands, etc).

The planned unit development (DP) has many of the same problems associated with the cluster subdivision; however, some there is some concern with the wording of the recommendation which would not permit the filing of a planned unit development if a development could be filed in a specific numbered district. Additionally, there was some question about prohibiting the filing of an approval petition for a modification of a DP and CS rezoning. Current Planning has had the same concerns and wording of these recommendations has been altered.

Requests for information:

None.

Decisions:

Land use categories were approved.

Concept of Critical Areas was forwarded with few changes from 1991-1993 Plan (Critical areas to be designated on the Land Use Map to avoid confusion).

Floodways and levees should be excluded from density calculations.

Assignments:

Complete the final report.

appendix five:

LAND USE CATEGORIES

The following land use categories broadly define development by density ranges and/or use. In the application of these recommendations for land uses decisions, these recommendations, while providing the starting point for a determination of the appropriateness of a land use request, must be placed in the context of the surrounding character and uses at a given location. The Plan anticipates that the current local conditions, the character of existing structures and uses, the most desirable use for the property, the conservation of property values, and the tenets of responsible development and growth will also be evaluated during the decision-making process.

Primary Land Use Classifications

Residential Development greater than 0.00 and equal to or less than 1.75 Units Per Acre.

This density is consistent with rural development patterns and could also limit the impact of development on property with extreme topography or other significant environmental considerations such as floodplains, wetlands and old-growth woodlands. Additionally, this density would be conducive to agricultural and estate development.

Residential Development greater than 1.75 and equal to or less than 3.50 Units Per Acre.

This density is consistent with single-family residential development in transitional areas between rural and suburban development patterns and is the typical density for single-family residential development in suburban areas of the City. Development at this density should not take place in rural and suburban areas where surrounding development patterns exhibit characteristics suitable for higher densities (property on mass transit corridors, near concentrations of employment, or near major commercial centers, for example).

Residential Development greater than 3.50 and equal to or less than 5.00 Units Per Acre.

This density is consistent with single-family residential development in suburban areas of the City and in transitional areas between suburban and

urban patterns of development. Development at this density should not take place on mass transit corridors. Multi-family residential development is acceptable, but is unlikely considering the density ranges recommended.

Residential Development greater than 5.00 and equal to or less than 8.00 Units Per Acre.

In suburban and rural areas this is a common multi-family density and typically the highest density single-family category in suburban areas. In urban areas, it is common for both single-family and multi-family development. Development at this density is appropriate along bus corridors but should not take place in proximity to planned light rail transit stops.

Residential Development greater than 8.00 and equal to or less than 15.00 Units Per Acre.

This density is typically the highest density serviceable in suburban areas. In suburban areas it would typically be a multi-family (apartment or condominium) category. In urban areas, this is the highest density single-family residential category and a common multi-family category. Development at this density is appropriate for all types of mass transit corridors.

Residential Development greater than 15.00 Units Per Acre.

This density is appropriate only within relatively intense urban areas where there is a full range of urban services and where those services have the capacity to accommodate the development. It may be appropriate in rare circumstances in suburban areas as assisted-living housing and as a buffer between major retail commercial uses and lower density residential uses. Development at this density is appropriate for all types of mass transit corridors.

Urban Mixed-Use

This land use category consists of existing areas of densely developed, pedestrian oriented, mixed-use (primarily commercial), development within the historic central city and first generation suburban areas of Indianapolis. The development pattern varies from location to location but typically includes multi-story buildings located at or near rights-of-way, with entrances and large windows facing the street. Parking is typically within, to the side,

or to the rear of buildings. Original building uses were retail and services on the ground floor with offices or apartments on subsequent floors. Future development in these areas should maintain the historic fabric of the existing development. This category is also used in areas where it is appropriate to replicate this older style of development or where it is appropriate to develop small (less than 5-acre) retail uses that serve the immediate neighborhood. The Plan anticipates that development of property with this recommendation would result from a public input process.

Village Mixed-Use

This land use category consists of a development focused on a mixed-use core of small, neighborhood office/retail nodes, public and semi public uses, open space and light industrial development. Residential development densities vary from compact single-family residential development and small-scale multi-family residential development near the “Main Street” or “Village Center” and progress to lower densities outward from this core. Village mixed use areas are intended to strengthen existing, historically rural, small towns and cities within Indianapolis, which are intended to continue as neighborhood gathering places and should allow a wide range of small businesses, housing types, and public and semi-public facilities. This category will allow development of residential and limited commercial uses on smaller lots than in other sections of rural and suburban Indianapolis. Potential development in these areas should focus on design issues related to architecture, building size, parking, landscaping and lighting to promote a pedestrian-oriented “village” or “small town” atmosphere, rather than focusing on residential density. Strip commercial development (integrated centers setback from rights-of-way by parking areas), large-scale freestanding retail uses and heavy industrial development are generally inappropriate within this land use category. The Plan anticipates that development of property with this recommendation would result from a public input process.

Office Commercial Uses

This land use category is for low-intensity office uses, integrated office development and compatible office-type uses. Retail uses are not promoted in this category, unless those uses are significantly subordinate to the primary office use or the retail use exclusively serves an abundance of office uses in proximity to the retail use. Office Commercial Uses can exist either as buffers between higher intensity land uses and lower intensity land uses or as major employment centers. The following uses are representative of this land use

category: medical and dental facilities, education services, insurance, real estate, financial institutions, design firms, legal services, day care centers, mortuaries, and communications studios.

Community Commercial Uses

This land use category is for low-intensity retail commercial and office uses, which serve a predominantly residential market adjacent to, or very near, the location of the use. The uses in this land use category are designed to fulfill a broad range of retail, personal, professional and business services and are either freestanding or part of a small integrated center typically anchored by a grocery store. These centers contain no, or extremely limited, outdoor display of merchandise. Generally, these uses are consistent with the following characteristics:

Maximum Gross Floor Area:	125,000 square feet
Maximum Acreage:	25 acres
Service Area Radius:	2 miles
Location:	On an arterial or at the intersection of an arterial with a collector.
Maximum Outlots:	3

Regional Commercial Uses

This land use category is for general commercial and office type uses, which serve a market that encompasses several residential neighborhoods or communities. The uses in this land use category tend to benefit greatly from major business grouping and regional-sized shopping centers; therefore, this land use category may consist of a collection of relatively large freestanding commercial uses and integrated centers. These uses are generally characterized by indoor operations, but may have accessory outdoor operations limited to approximately 5 to 10 percent of a use's gross floor area. Generally, these uses are consistent with the following characteristics:

Maximum Gross Floor Area:	1,000,000 square feet
Service Area Radius:	15 miles
Location:	On a primary arterial near the intersection with a secondary or primary arterial.
Maximum Outlots:	As needed.

Heavy Commercial

This land use category is for general commercial and related office type uses. The uses in this land use category tend to exhibit characteristics that are not compatible with less intensive land uses and are predominantly devoted to exterior operations, sales and display of goods; such as automobile sales and heavy equipment sales.

Location:

On a primary arterial

Light Industrial

This land use category consists of industrial uses, which are conducted within enclosed structures and which may have no, or extremely limited outdoor storage requirements. Those industrial uses that require no outdoor storage can be considered appropriate buffers, provided the use does not exhibit characteristics incompatible with less intensive land uses. This category, regardless of the amount of outdoor storage, is considered an appropriate buffer between general industrial uses and less intensive land uses. Light industrial uses should create minimal impact on adjacent property.

General Industrial

This land use category consists of industrial uses, which are intensive and are characterized by outdoor operations, significant requirements for outdoor storage, and/or intense emissions of light, odor, noise and vibration. These uses may have significant impacts that are difficult, expensive or impossible to completely eliminate or buffer from adjacent properties.

Park

This land use category consists of public or private property designated for active and/or passive recreational amenities.

Linear Park

This land use category consists of public or private property designated for active and/or passive recreational amenities and is primarily used for the passage of people or wildlife. Typical examples are greenways and parkways.

Special Use

This land use category consists of a variety public, semi-public and private land uses that either serve a specific public purpose (such as schools, churches, libraries, neighborhood centers and public safety facilities) or are unique uses exhibiting significant impacts on adjacent property (such as the Indianapolis International Airport, Indiana State Fair, and Indianapolis Motor Speedway).

Airport Related Mixed-Use

This land use category consists of commercial and industrial land uses that are considered complementary to airport development but do not exhibit characteristics incompatible with sensitive land uses. This land use category is intended as a buffer between airports and more sensitive land uses. All residential development is inappropriate within this district.

Floodway

This land use classification consists of areas within the floodway. These areas exhibit a great potential for property loss and damage or for water quality degradation and should not be developed. Nonconforming uses currently within a floodway should not be expanded or altered. For residential density calculations, property within this category is recommended for zero units per acre.

Secondary Land Use Classification

Environmentally Sensitive

This secondary land use classification consists of land possessing special environmental or potentially valuable natural characteristics that require careful attention with regard to development proposals. Steeply sloped areas, high-quality woodlands, wetlands, significant aquifers, or other waterbody resources are examples of this designation.

appendix six:

GLOSSARY OF PLANNING RELATED TERMS AND ACRONYMS

Many sources of information have been used to prepare this glossary. Included are the *Indianapolis Star* newspaper, the *Indianapolis Business Journal*, the *Unigov Handbook*, prepared by the League of Women Voters; *The Encyclopedia of Indianapolis*, prepared by The Polis Center at IUPUI; the *Dictionary of Banking Terms*, prepared by Barron's Business Guides, the *Rainbow Book*, prepared by the Information and Referral Network, Inc.; *Principles and Practices of Urban Planning*, prepared by the Institute for Training in Municipal Administration; and many documents prepared by the staff of the Department of Metropolitan Development and other agencies listed below. Also the helpful staff members of the Department of Metropolitan Development have contributed a great deal to the information provided here.

Affordable Housing: A housing unit (owned or rented) that costs the occupants less than 30% of the occupants income. Numbers vary based on family size.

Brownfield: Abandoned, idled, or under utilized industrial and commercial facilities where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination.

Building Codes: Local government regulations that prescribe minimum standards for the construction and maintenance of buildings.

Building Permit: A permit issued by the Division of Permits of the Department of Metropolitan Development. Various types of building permits authorize structural, electrical, heating and cooling, plumbing, or wrecking work. For more information contact the Division of Permits at 327-8700.

Central Indiana Regional Citizens League (CIRCL): A general citizen-based organization that provides the means for citizens to have input into the decisions affecting quality of life issues in central Indiana. Even though the group has only been in operation for a year, CIRCL already has a membership of 330 groups and individuals. For more information call 921-1282.

Certificate of Appropriateness: A certificate issued by the Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission authorizing exterior changes to building and grounds in locally designated historic areas. A certificate of appropriateness is needed before a building permit allowing construction or demolition is issued for these areas. The certificate reflects a determination that

the changes are in keeping with the historic character of the area and are appropriate to the building, site, or streetscape. For more information contact IHPC at 327-4406.

Cluster: A group of buildings and especially houses built close together on a sizable tract in order to preserve open spaces larger than the individual plot of land for common recreation.

Comprehensive Plan Segment (CPS): A segment of the Comprehensive Plan for Marion County. Comprehensive plan segments become a part of City policy when adopted by the Metropolitan Development Commission. Adopted Comprehensive plan segments have CPS numbers assigned to them. Examples of comprehensive plan segments are neighborhood plans, township plans, corridor plans, park master plans, and the Official Thoroughfare Plan.

Critical Area: An area which exhibits and unusual character, important location, or significant infrastructures need that warrants a high degree of scrutiny. Critical area recommendations address significant land use issues that require more detailed information than can be shown on the Comprehensive Plan Map.

Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD): A City department that plans and implements projects and services focused on public safety, jobs and economic development, affordable housing, and the empowerment of neighborhoods through citizen participation. For more information call 327-3698.

Development Monitoring System (DMS): A system of information gathered from the City's permit processes. Information available from the Development Monitoring System includes: 1.) the number of housing permits issued by township or census tract; 2.) the number of commercial permits issued by township; 3.) the number of industrial permits issued by township; 4.) the number of new and demolished housing units listed by single, duplex, multi-family, and condominiums construction type; 5.) the amount of new retail, office, and other commercial space; 6.) the amount of new manufacturing and warehouse space; 7.) the value of new commercial space; 8.) the value of new industrial; and 9.) the value of the total demolished commercial space. Information is not available for the cities of Beech Grove, Lawrence, Speedway, and Southport. The Division regularly prepares housing starts and losses and other similar reports based on the DMS information. For more information call Robert Uhlenhake at 327-5685.

Development Plan: A planned development unit characterized by creative planning, variety in physical development, imaginative uses of open spaces. Predominantly residential in nature, but may include supportive commercial, or industrial development.

Division of Neighborhood Services: A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development that includes Township Administrators. For the Township Administrators call 327-5039.

Division of Permits: A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development that is responsible for assuring that construction activity in the city complies with state and municipal building standards. For more information contact the Division of Permits at 327-8700.

Division of Planning (DOP): A division of the Department of Metropolitan Development that analyzes community conditions, makes projections, recommends plans for private and public projects. The division also includes the Current Planning section. For more information call 327-5151. For more information regarding Current Planning call 327-5155.

Excluded Cities and Towns: The three cities of Beech Grove, Lawrence, and Southport and the town of Speedway that were not annexed into the Consolidated City of Indianapolis.

Floodway/plain: Level land that may be submerged by floodwaters. A plain built up by stream deposition

Geographic Information System (GIS): A means of producing, analyzing, and storing computerized maps. See **Indianapolis Mapping and**

Goal: The end toward which planning and development efforts are directed. Goals are broad based in nature, but they are more refined than values.

Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA): A Federal Reserve regulation requiring depository institutions to make annual disclosure of the location of certain residential loans, to determine whether depository institutions are meeting the credit needs of their local community. The Division of Planning receives information from this reporting process and can produce reports based on the information. For more information call 327-5151.

Home Owners' Association (HOA): Organization of residents within a community that collect fees, care for common areas, enforce covenants, and disseminate neighborhood information.

Household: A household includes all the persons who occupy a housing unit. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated persons who share living arrangements.

Housing Units: A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms or a single room occupied as separate living quarters or, if vacant, intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall.

Improvement Location Permit (ILP): A "zoning clearance" permit issued by the Division of Permits of the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development. Generally an ILP is required when a new structure is built, the bulk of an existing structure is increased, or a change in the use of property causes an increase in parking requirements. For more information contact the Division of Permits at 327-8700.

Indianapolis Airport Authority (IAA): A body formed to administer and develop an air transportation system for Marion County and central Indiana. For more information call the IAA at 487-9594.

Indianapolis Mapping and Geographic Infrastructure System (IMAGIS): The computerized map of Marion County that, when complete, will include information on soils, topography, zoning, utilities, and tax assessment for all parcels.

Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center (INRC): Works to strengthen the capacity of neighborhood-based organizations to effect positive change in their communities through training, support, and technical assistance. For more information contact INRC at 920-0330.

Indianapolis Regional Transportation Improvement Program (IRTIP): Presents transportation improvements proposed by government and transportation agencies in the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Area for a three year period. The current IRTIP covers 1998 through the year 2000. For more information contact Mike Dearing at 327-5139.

Indianapolis Urbanized Area (IUA): Census tracts in central Indiana that were identified as a part of the 1990 as making up urbanized area of Indianapolis. This area is smaller than the MPA. See map on page 2.

IndyGo: Provides mass transit service to the Marion County area over fixed routes and uses scheduled times of arrival and departure. For more information call 635-2100.

Infrastructure: The underlying foundation or basic framework of a city, including streets, parks, bridges, sewers, street lights, and other utilities.

Landmark: An individual, physical element that serves as a reference point in locating a node or district. The Soldiers and Sailors Monument is a good example of a landmark.

Light Industrial: A land use plan category recommending industries that conduct their entire operations within completely enclosed buildings and do not have objectionable characteristics that extend beyond their property lines. Some examples are jewelry manufacturing and engraving, warehousing, construction companies, upholstering, paper box and paper products manufacturing from finished paper, and manufacturing of optical goods.

Low Density Residential: A land use plan category recommending 2 - 5 dwelling units per acre. Development may be single-family and two-family houses.

Marion County Alliance of Neighborhood

Associations (MCANA): A voluntary organization of neighborhood associations in Marion County created to deal with common issues. For more information call Cathy Burton (317) 862-3014.

Marion County Health and Hospital Corporation:

Charged with protecting the public health and providing hospital services, the Health and Hospital Corporation operates county wide.

The Division of Public Health records statistical data, and issues birth and death certificates. The Bureau of Community Health Nursing administers nursing services in schools, homes and neighborhood clinics. The Bureau of Environmental Health inspects housing for code compliance, inspects and licenses food establishments, evaluates occupational health hazards and monitors sanitation facilities. It also deals with communicable disease and has an immunization program. There are six Neighborhood Nursing Offices in addition to the Well Baby and Maternity Clinics, Geriatric and Chronic Disease Clinics and the Bell Flower Clinic for sexually transmitted diseases.

Although the Hospital Division is responsible for Wishard Memorial Hospital, the Indiana University School of Medicine is contracted to manage the hospital. Housed within the hospital is the Midtown Community Mental Health Center, which also has clinics placed throughout the city.

Marion County Wellfield Education Corporation: An organization whose purpose is to prevent contamination to the valuable groundwater resources of Marion County through public awareness and education.

Mayor's Action Center (MAC): An agency that assists citizens of Indianapolis and Marion County in contacting and soliciting services from the city. The MAC takes complaints and requests for service, gives information, and provides regulations regarding abandoned buildings and vehicles, air pollution, dead animal pick-up, fallen trees and limbs, sewer and drainage problems, street and sidewalk maintenance, trash burning and dumping violations, and weed control. For more information call Joanna Batchelor at 327-4622.

Metropolitan Area: The concept of a metropolitan area (MA) is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. Some MA's are defined around two or more nuclei. The MA classification is a statistical standard, developed for use by Federal agencies in the production, analysis, and publication of data on MA's. The MA's are designated and defined by the Federal Office of Management and Budget, following a set of official published standards.

Metropolitan Association of Greater Indianapolis Communities (MAGIC): A regional organization involving individuals within central Indiana to address issues affecting the business climate. For more information contact Lee Lewellen at 464-2243.

Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC): The policy-making body of the Department of Metropolitan Development. It has nine appointed members who serve a one-year term. For more information call 327-3698.

Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA): The portion of central Indiana that is expected to be urbanized in the next twenty years. It is the area studied by the MPO and includes all of Marion County and portions of the surrounding counties including the cities of Beech Grove, Indianapolis, Lawrence, Southport, and the town of Speedway. The boundary also includes portions of Hamilton, Boone, Hendricks, Johnson, and Hancock counties, including the municipalities of Fishers, Westfield, Whiteland, New Whiteland, and the cities of Carmel, Zionsville, Brownsburg, Plainfield, and Greenwood. This area is larger than the IUA. See map on page 2.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO): The Metropolitan Development Commission is the designated MPO for the Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Area. The MPO has the responsibility, together with the state and IPTC, for the continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process required of urbanized areas to qualify for federal transportation funds. For more information contact Mike Peoni at 327-5133.

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA): A definition of central Indiana used to report Census information. Counties included in the MSA are Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, Hendricks, Johnson, Madison, Marion, Morgan, and Shelby. The MSA was formerly called the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area or SMSA. Madison County has been added to the MSA since the 1990 Census was prepared. The MSA had a 1980 population of 1,166,575 and a 1990 population of 1,249,822. See map on page 2.

Mobile Dwelling: A land use plan category recommending a density of approximately 6 dwelling units per acre. Development may be in the form of a mobile home park.

Multiple Family Development: Housing units in a structure containing 3 or more housing units.

Neighborhood Park: A land use plan category recommending a park of between 5 and 25 acres that serves the immediately surrounding neighborhood. A neighborhood park usually includes facilities for basketball, tennis, picnicking, and a playground.

Neighborhood Shopping Center: A land use plan category recommending a commercial center on one parcel that usually has a grocery store or drugstore as an anchor.

North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS): Replacing the SIC system, the NAICS is a system of employment classification developed for the purpose of facilitating the collection, tabulation, presentation, and analysis of data relating to employment and for promoting uniformity and comparability in the presentation of statistical data collected by various agencies of the United States Government, state agencies, trade associations, and private research organizations. The NAICS is intended to cover the entire field of economic activities: agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting and trapping; mining and construction; manufacturing; transportation, communications, electric, gas, and sanitary services; wholesale trade; retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; personal, business, professional, repair, recreation, and other services; and public administration.

Not in My Back Yard (NIMBY): Land uses that most people don't want near their homes, such as power plants and junk yards.

Objective: A quantifiable refinement of a goal or means of achieving a goal. Objectives often relate to more than one goal.

Planned Unit Development (PUD): A development which, for zoning approval purposes, is not judged by typical zoning standards but on the basis of an overall plan for the total development. To be approved by the zoning review agency, the plan must include detailed information regarding such issues as land use, building height, density, and setbacks at the overall edge of the development.

Quality of Life: The attributes or amenities that combine to make an area a good place to live. Examples include the availability of political, educational, and social support systems; good relations among constituent groups; a healthy physical environment; and economic opportunities for both individuals and businesses.

Regional Center (RC): A 5.8 square mile area bounded by I-65 and a line extending west from I-65 on the north, I-65 and I-70 on the east, I-70 on the south, and the previously proposed alignment of Harding Street improvements on the west. Plans were prepared for this area in 1970, 1980, and 1990.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO): A method of providing housing for homeless people that some cities have used. Often an old hotel building is modified to provide one person per room, permanent housing.

Social Assets and Vulnerability Indicators (SAVI): The Community Service Council and The Polis Center have developed a database of information from sources such as the U.S. Census, the Indianapolis Police Department, the Marion County Sheriff's Department, the Family and Social Services Administration, and the Marion County Health Department. Information in this database can be displayed on a Marion County map. This database includes information about the people that live in Marion and their social condition. For more information contact the Community Service Council at 923-1466 or Polis at 274-2455.

Special Use: A land use plan category recommending a wide variety of special uses including churches, schools, government property, power substations, switching stations, non-profit agencies, nursing homes, hospitals, union halls, and cemeteries.

Sub-Neighborhood Park: A land use plan category recommending a park of between 1/4 and 5 acres that usually serves a specific age group within the immediate neighborhood. Facilities may include a playground, sitting area, and multi-purpose game area.

Supplemental Review: A process in zoning when a proposed development may be reviewed by various city agencies and neighborhood organizations to receive recommendations for consideration as a part of the rezoning process.

Technically Qualified Person (TQP): An individual selected by the Metropolitan Development Commission to review site and development plans for

sites located within a wellfield and to conduct inspections and monitor compliance of agreed upon conditions for the Improvement Location Permit process.

Township Administrators: The Department of Metropolitan Development has assigned a Township Administrator to each of the nine townships within Marion County. The Township Administrators provide assistance in establishing new neighborhood organizations, bring community groups together which may benefit from combining forces in addressing common issues, attend community meetings to hear citizen and business concerns first hand and address them with the appropriate government officials, and educate the public on zoning ordinance interpretation and land use issues and how they can participate in the zoning process. Also Township Administrators assist merchants in business expansion or relocation focusing on the economic needs of the community; assist in locating vacant properties and buildings; provide businesses with applicable zoning ordinances, re-zoning, and variance information; provide information about permitting issues; and assist in the formation of new merchants organizations. For more information call 327-5039.

Traffic Impact Study (TIS): An analysis of certain new developments to determine the impact on the surrounding transportation system. For more information call Steve Cunningham at 327-5403.

Uniform Building Code (UBC): National building construction standards first developed in 1927 for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the building occupants. The UBC was designed to create greater safety to the public by providing uniformity in building laws. Topics covered in the code include fire safety, appropriate use of building materials, size of public spaces, and special hazards. The UBC is the basis for the State's review of certain types of new construction. For more information contact Fire and Building Services at 232-6422.

UNIGOV: Title 36, Article 3 of the State of Indiana Code detailing the combined governments of the City of Indianapolis and Marion County, Indiana. Effective January 1, 1970, UNIGOV legislation permitted the City of Indianapolis to provide most municipal services county wide.

The City Council and the County Council were joined to become the City-County Council. The structure of the UNIGOV legislation was divided into three branches similar to the federal government: the executive branch consisted of the Mayor and other administrators; the legislative branch consisted of the

City-County Council; and the judicial branch consisted of the court system.

Urban Conservation: A land use plan category given to land possessing special environmental or valuable natural characteristics, such as wetlands, woodlands, and aquifers.

Value: An ideal, custom, institution, etc. that the people of a society try to achieve.

Very Low Density Residential: A land use plan category recommending 0 - 2 dwelling units per acre. Development may be single-family houses with two-family houses permitted on corner lots.

Vision Statement: A vivid, imaginative conception of the future.

Wellfield: A tract of land that contains one or more wells used for the production of drinking water for the public water supply. For information regarding the protection of Indianapolis wellfields contact 327-5151.